DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 217 CS 505 643

AUTHOR Korzenny, Felipe; Schiff, Elizabeth
TITLE Hispanic Perceptions of Communication Discrimination.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Cultural Context; Cultural Differences; Ethnic Bias; *Hispanic Americans; *Intercultural Communication; Minority Groups; Negative Attitudes; Social Attitudes; Social Bias; *Social Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS California (San Francisco); Discrimination Complaints

ABSTRACT

A study examined Hispanic perceptions of discriminatory behavior by Anglos, exploring four dimensions of perceived discrimination: the contexts/situations where Hispanics discern discrimination, the attributes perceived by Hispanics as eliciting discriminatory behavior, the characteristics of those Anglos perceived to be most likely to discriminate, and the behaviors that can be interpreted as discriminatory. Subjects, 112 self-identified Hispanics in the San Francisco Bay area, were interviewed by telephone in 1985. Results indicated that in most contexts/situations respondents felt that discrimination took place "once in a while"--but more frequently at work or school, at government offices or in department stores, and on the part of landlords. Findings showed that younger, richer, and more educated males were perceived as more likely to discriminate against Hispanics. Accent, national background, ways of speaking, and race were generally agreed upon as predictive of discrimination. (References and tables of data are attached.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285217

HISPANIC PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION DISCRIMINATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Felipe Korzenny and Elizabeth Schiff

Department of Speech and Communication Studies

San Francisco State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western States Speech Communication Association, Tucson, Arizona, February 15-18, 1986.

The contributions of the following individuals made this research possible: Gail Alderman, Laurel Clark, Heidi Guttormsen, Eva Lokey, Rebecca Michals, Sandra Rivas, Marcus Valle, Harvey Varga, and Alyson Wylie.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Felipe Korzenny, Department of Speech and Communication Studies, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Ave., San Francisco, CA 94132.

CS505643

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Felipe Korzenny

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The present study was designed to obtain an overall picture of the relative importance of different manifestations of communication phenomena interpreted as discriminatory. In addition, the individual contribution of a set of predictors of communication discrimination was assessed. Four dimensions of perceived discrimination were explored: the contexts/situations where Hispanics perceive discrimination to take place; the attributes perceived by Hispanics as elicitors of discriminatory behaviors on the part of Anglos; the characteristics of those Anglos perceived to be more likely to discriminate; and the behaviors which can be interpreted as being discriminatory by Hispanics. Contexts, in particular work and school, were found to be the most important predictors of communication discrimination.

Sumario

Este estudio fue diseñado para obtener un imagen global de la importancia de diferentes manifestaciones de los fenómenos comunicativos interpretados como discriminatorios. Además, se midió la contribución individual de una serie de predictores de la discriminación comunicativa. Se exploraron cuatro dimensiones de la discriminación comunicativa: los contextos y situaciones donde los Hispanos perciben la discriminación; los atributos Hispanos que ellos mismos perciben como causas de la conducta discriminatoria; las características de los Anglos asociadas con la discriminación; y las conductas que los Hispanos interpretan como discriminatorias. Se encontró que los contextos, particularmente la escuela y el trabajo, son los más importantes predictores de la discriminación comunicativa.

HISPANIC PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION DISCRIMINATION

Despite the many advances made by the civil rights movements and ethnic awareness groups which erupted in the 1960's, discrimination still persists in American society. By understanding the machinations of discrimination, we may be in a better position to eliminate it. A review of exisiting literature revealed that most authors examined discrimination from the point of view of the discriminators, or those groups who discriminated against others (Allport, 1954; Berry and Tischler, 1978; Brislin, 1981; Ehrlich, 1973; Levine, 1972; Marin, 1984; McLemore, 1983; Rose, 1981). Our research uncovered an absence of material on the other point of view of discrimination, that of the discriminatee, or those persons who are the victims of discrimination. Because discrimination involves communication, and communication is a two way process, it cannot be fully understood until both sides of the process are taken into consideration. Hence, this study represents an attempt to focus on the heretofore neglected perceptions of the discriminatees.

To be perceived, discrimination ought to be communicated, or at least perceived as having been communicated, otherwise for practical purposes it has not taken place. We will not here enter into a discussion on the nature of intercultural communication;

however, in communication between members of different cultural groups the "attribution of meaning" across cultures is considered to be an essential component of the process (Gudykunst and Kim, 1984, p. 14).

Also, to be perceived, discrimination must involve differential treatment from the point of view of a societal norm, and it ought to be considered offensive or insulting. Both charateristics of *different* and *offensive* must be present because in the absence of either one, no discrimination would be attributed. With these considerations in mind, we speak of *communication discrimination*, the key concept of interest in the present paper. Communication discrimination is then the process of the attribution of meaning involving perceptions of differential and offensive treatment. Other researchers have addressed the issue of perceptual differences between different cultural groups (Brislin, 1981; Oddou, 1984; Triandis, 1964) as well as discrepancies in communication styles and satisfaction (Hecht, 1978, 1984; Kagan, 1982; Triandis, 1984). None of these studies, however, have dealt directly with communication discrimination.

What are the conditions under which minority members perceive discrimination to take place, particularly communication discrimination? What are the contexts where communication discrimination is perceived (e.g. work, school, stores, etc..)?; Who are likely discriminators (younger or older persons, males or females, etc.)?;What is the discrimination believed to be based on

(e.g. skin color, accent, dress, national origin, ways of speaking, etc.)? What are communication discrimination behaviors which happen with high frequency (e.g. talk down to minorities; show little respect for; make fun of, etc.)? And, what are those factors considered to account for the perceptions of communication discrimination? These are the questions which motivated the research reported here.

Kurt Lewin argued "that the phenomena to which the psychologist should direct his attention are what the individual subjectively perceives, not what the observer perceives as the 'objective reality'" (Shepherd, 1964, p. 24). The perceptions of the discriminatees could be used to alert co-workers, service providers, and others to behaviors which might be considered differentiating and offensive, and the contexts or situations where such perceptions are more likely to occur.

In a landmark set of studies of Hispanic American communication in seven U.S. communities (Greenberg, Burgoon, Burgoon, and Korzenny, 1983), Hispanic leaders argued that discrimination and racism were the key overriding problems in their communities. According to Dr. Armando Navarro of San Bernardino, California, "Socially, the poverty syndrome, coupled with racism, is transforming the barrios into concrete jungles where violence and self-destruction prevail" (p. 60).

Racism was said to be a constant theme and it was related to the main problems of education, employment, politics, housing, health, and crime.

Within the same set of studies, when comparing adult Anglo and Hispanic respondents from the general population, the satisfaction with the coverage of local Hispanic persons and events in local newspapers was less for the Hispanics. The perception of fairness of Hispanic coverage in the local media in general was also seen as inferior by Hispanics when compared to Anglo perceptions. The above results support the notion that Hispanics tend to feel discriminated against both interpersonally and through the media. How and under what conditions is that discrimination perceived?

In order to guide the present inquiry, an initial pilot study of 20 in-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with 10 adult males and 10 adult females who identified themselves as Hispanics. The respondents were asked to report their top-of-mind reactions to the word discrimination, and the situations in which they feel discrimination against them takes place if at all. On the bases of these qualitative interviews four general dimensions of communication discrimination were uncovered: (1) Types of people who are perceived as being more likely to discriminate; (2) Attributes which are perceived to be likely to elicit discriminatory behaviors; (3) Situations/contexts where discrimination is perceived to occur; and (4) Behaviors which are

perceived as discriminatory. The responses provided within each of the above dimensions became the base for operationalization as detailed in the methods section.

On the basis of the above considerations, three general research questions guided this study:

Q_1: What is the relative importance of different types of persons, attributes, contexts/situations, and behaviors in the perception of discrimination by Hispanics?

Q_2: How do person types, attributes, and situations influence perceptions of discriminatory behaviors against Hispanics in general?

Q_3: How do person types, attributes, and situations influence perceptions of discrimination against Hispanics in particular?

With the first question an attempt is made to obtain a description of the relative importance of individual factors perceived by Hispanics to be reflective of discrimination, e.g. is skin color considered to be a basis for discrimination?, is work a context where discrimination is perceived to take place?, etc..

The second question attempts to obtain a picture of the relationships between discriminative factors (contexts, types of

persons, characteristics of the discriminatee) and those behaviors which are considered to constitute discrimination against Hispanics in general (to be talked down to, to be ignored, etc.).

The third question is similar to the second except that it attempts to more directly tap the factors which account for the individual's perception of discrimination against him/her as the subject of discrimination (instead of against Hispanics in general).

METHODS

Subjects

In the Spring of 1985, 112 self-identified Hispanics were interviewed over the phone in the San Francisco Bay area. Fifty two percent of the respondents were females. The subjects self-identified themselves as follows: Hispanic (11%), Latino (16%), Chicano (5%), Spanish (8%), Mexican (12%), Hispanic American (11%), Mexican American (20%), Central American (11%), or "other" such as Cuban American, Puerto Rican, Argentinian, etc. (6%).

The average number of years the respondents had lived in the U.S. was 25.3 (S=14), and their average age was 34.4 (S=12).

The modal level of education completed was high school, trade, tech., or vocational school (43%), 14% had not finished high school, 18% had some college education, 9% had completed a two year college program, and 17% had completed a four year college degree. The modal level of total household income was between $15,000.00 and $20,000.00, and 51% fell between $10,000 and $25,000.00 per year.

Instrument

The respondents were asked four general categories of questions based on the pilot interviews. First, to understand the contextual and situational aspects of perceived communication discrimination, the respondents were asked to report "How often would you say that Anglos treat Hispanics differently from the way they treat other Anglos..." on a Likert type scale with "very often" coded 3, "often" coded 2, "once in a while" coded 1, and "never" coded 0. Non applicable, refused, and "don't know" responses were eliminated from the analysis. The situations rated were: "at work," "at school," "at the grocery store," "at government offices," "at the bank," "at the doctor's office," "at department stores," "at restaurants," "as neighbors," "as friends," "as landlords or landladies." For the purposes of data reduction and regression analyses, these scales were submitted to a principal factor analysis with varimax rotation, utilizing the criterion of a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 to stop the extraction of factors. All variables with loadings of .50 or larger were summed and then

divided by the number of variables to form indexes. The first index labeled *public places* was composed of the first eight scales detailed above which loaded on the first factor (M=0.8, SD=0.6). A second index was formed with the last three scales above, which loaded on the second factor, and was labeled *personal contexts* (M=0.8, SD=0.8).

To obtain insights regarding the types of Anglo persons perceived to be likely to discriminate, the respondents responded to the stem: "Those Anglos that treat Hispanics differently from the way they treat other Anglos are usually...." followed by four statements: "younger rather than older;" "males rather than females;" "with higher rather than lower education;" and "rich rather than poor." The respondents were asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement ("strongly agree"=3; "agree"=2; "disagree"=1; and "strongly disagree"=0) with these statements. The intercorrelations among the four scales were examined for the purpose of data reduction. Only the correlation between "with higher rather than lower eduation" and "rich rather than poor" were substantially correlated (r=0.45, p=.001). An average index was created with these two scales and labeled *SES of discriminator* (M=1.5, S=0.7). Since the other two scales were not intercorrelated, they were kept separate in further analyses.

The attributes perceived to elicit discrimination were rated in response to "Anglos treat Hispanics differently because of...." The respondents were asked to express their degree of agreement

or disagreement with the following attributes (scale same as above): "skin color," "accent," "dress," "national background," "ways of speaking," and "race." The results of a factor analysis of these scales resulted in a unique factor on which all variables loaded at .40 or higher. On the basis of this information an average index was created and named *ethnic attributes* (M=1.9, SD=0.5).

The behaviors considered to represent discrimination in general were rated on a frequency Likert type scale ("very often"=3, "often"=2, "once in a while"=1, and "never"=0) in response to the stem "When Hispanics deal with Hispanics, how often...." followed by these behaviors: "do they show little interest in the opinions of Hispanics?", "are they insulting to Hispanics?", "do they ignore Hispanics?", "do they make fun of Hispanics?", "do they make comments about the ethnic origin of Hispanics?", "are they impatient with Hispanics?", "do they show little respect for Hispanics?", "do they avoid talking to Hispanics?", "do they tell ethnic or racial jokes about Hispanics?", "do they talk down to Hispanics?", "do they exclude Hispanics from their activities?" and "do they avoid looking at Hispanics directly?" All these scales loaded on a single factor and the resulting average index was labeled *general discrimination* (M=1.3, S=0.7).

The measure utilized to detect *personal/specific* discrimination was the product of two frequency scales (coded as

above; composite measure M=1.7, SD=2.3) in response to "How often do you feel that Anglos treat you differently from the way they treat other Anglos?" (M=1.0, SD=0.9) multiplied by "How offensive would you say that being treated differently is? (M=1.4, SD=1.1). The reason for creating a multiplicative scale was that if either of the two scales was "never" (coded 0), then the value of the measure would be 0, or no perceived discrimination.

Besides the demographics detailed above, the following control measures were obtained: A measure of *Spanish language dependence* was created as an average index (M=1.3, SD=1.5), including the responses to questions eliciting the number of Spanish language TV hours watched yesterday (M=0.5, SD=1.4), number of Spanish language radio hours listened to yesterday (M=0.5, SD=1.4), and "About how much time did you spend yesterday speaking in Spanish?" (M=2.9 hrs., SD=3.0).

Procedure

Telephone prefixes in the San Francisco Bay Area were originally selected for areas known to contain a high concentration of Hispanics. Four random digits were added to the prefixes to account for unlisted numbers and to enhance representativeness. The response rate was approximately 20% after accounting for disconnected, out of order, Anglo, refused, no answer, and disqualified numbers. To qualify, the interview was to be conducted with a Hispanic "man or woman of the house."

Hispanics were all those who said that any of the following words "best described" them: Hispanic, Latino, Chicano , Spanish , Mexican , Hispanic American , Mexican American , Central American , or "other" such as Cuban American, Puerto Rican, Argentinian, etc.. Three call backs were attempted in the cases of no answer, or when the qualifying individual was not home. Only one individual was interviewed in each household. All interviews were conducted in English, and there were no reports of ended interviews due to a language barrier. Out of ten interviewers, three were Hispanic.

RESULTS

The results of this research will be presented in the order of the three main questions presented in the introductory section to this paper. The first question asks about the relative importance of particular situations or contexts, particular types of persons, idiosyncratic characteristics or attributes on which discrimination is based, and specific behaviors which can be considered to be discriminatory. Table 1 presents the means for each of the scales which were used to assess the above sets of perceptions. Regarding <u>situations or contexts</u>, none of the particular scales rendered a mean value larger than "1" which corresponded to "once in a while"; the lowest means were for the grocery store, the bank, the doctor's office, and with friends.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Regarding types of persons perceived as discriminators, younger persons, males, richer individuals, and people with a higher education were similarly perceived to be more likely to discriminate against Hispanics than older persons, females, people with a lower education, and poorer persons.

As to attributes which are perceived as elicitors of discrimination, the respondents generally "agreed" that skin color, accent, dress, national background, ways of speaking and race are used for discrimination; however, skin color and dress were somewhat less endorsed as personal characteristics conducive to discrimination.

In terms of the frequency of perception of discriminating behaviors, most scales rendered a mean in between the values of "once in a while" and "often". The only scale that rendered a clearly low mean was "avoid looking at Hispanics directly."

The general profile which has emerged up to this point is that there are no behaviors, characteristics/attributes, contexts/situations, or types of persons which are strongly felt to be the basis of discrimination in the relationships between Anglos and Hispanics. However, it was evident that accent, national

background, ways of speaking, and race, were more clearly identified as elicitors of discrimination than the items in any of the other categories under study. It was also interesting to notice that eye contact was the behavioral manifestation least likely to be perceived as being absent in the interactions between Anglos and Hispanics.

The second and third questions that motivated this study concerned the relationships between the perceptions of situations/contexts, types of persons who discriminate, and the attributes of the discrimatee, with perceptions of discrimination towards Hispanics in general, and towards the Hispanic respondents in particular. To attempt to answer these two questions, multiple regression analyses were conducted utilizing the indexes of contexts/situations, attributes, and types of persons as predictors.The regression analyses were conducted through a simultaneous inclusion routine. The indexes of general discriminating behaviors towards Hispanics and *personal/specific* perceptions of discrimination were the two dependent variables in the regression equations. Age, number of years in the U.S., income, education, sex, whether the person was married or not, whether the individual was employed or not, general exposure to TV, radio, and newspapers, and Spanish language dependence were included in the equations as controls in an attempt to exclude alternative explanations.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 presents the results of two multiple regression equations in which general communication discrimination and *personal/specific* communication discrimination (*comdis*) are predicted.

The *general comdis* index was labeled "general" because the items comprising it referred to Hispanics in general. The statistically significant predictors were *public places* first, followed by *personal contexts*, and finally by *ethnic attributes*.

In predicting *personal/specific* perceptions of discrimination, i.e. the respondents' own interpretations of Anglos' behaviors, *personal contexts* was the largest preditor with a negative sign, followed by *public places*, then by *males* as the perpetrators of discriminatory acts, and finally by ethnic attributes.

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to answer three research questions derived from the literature and the experience of the authors regarding perceptions of discrimination on the part of Hispanics. First, it was of interest to obtain an overall picture of

the relative importance of different manifestations of the phenomena interpreted as discriminatory. Several items were included within each of the following conceptual categories: the contexts/situations where Hispanics perceive discrimination to take place; the attributes perceived by Hispanics as elicitors of discriminatory behaviors on the part of Anglos; the characteristics of those Anglos perceived to be more likely to discriminate; and the behaviors which can be interpreted as being discriminatory by Hispanics. In studying the relative importance of each item within the general categories above, it was evident that in most contexts/situations the respondents feel there is discrimination "once in a while" or somewhat more often. The contexts where discrimination is slightly more frequently perceived are at work, at school, at government offices, at department stores, and on the part of landlords and landladies. The places where discrimination is least likely to be experienced is at the doctor's office, at the grocery store, at the bank, and with Anglo friends. Although not strong, this finding is important because it emphasizes that in those places where Hispanics must spend the largest amount of time, e.g. at work and school, they are more likely to experience discrimination. One can speculate that discrimination is least felt at the "doctor's office", "bank", and "grocery store" because those are contexts where individuals have more abundant choices.

The perceived picture of those more likely to discriminate against Hispanics was one of younger, male, richer, more educated

individuals. However, the findings are not strong in their absolute size. Most likely, the respondents might have felt uncertain regarding those who are more likely to discriminate. All responses to these scales fell half way between the "agree" and "disagree" categories. The responses given may be quite accurate because in confronting generalized prejudice, Hispanics may be unable to pinpoint the exact demographic profile of those who discriminate.

The attributes perceived by Hispanics as being the cues to discrimination resulted in means very closely overlapping with the "agree" response category on the scales. The only two exceptions were skin color and dress, which received a slightly lower score. Accent, national background, ways of speaking, and race were generally agreed upon as cues to discrimination. As Hispanics are not necessarily very distinct in skin color or dress patterns, it is not surprising that these two attributes received lower scores as cues to discrimination. It appears significant, however, that among the relatively highly scored attributes are speech patterns along with the race and origin of the person.

Speech patterns appear to become fully integrated in the ways individuals build an image of themselves.

> At the interpersonal level, for example, attitudes about language operate to define and reify systems of social categorization... Most people hold strong beliefs about

particular speech patterns and these in turn affect judgments about individuals and opportunities granted to them. (Kramarae, 1984, p. 265-266).

Hispanics may thus rightly perceive that they are discriminated against because of their "deviant" speech patterns. This coincides with one of the author's experience as a teacher of English as a second language, in that many Hispanic students expressed the opinion that they were being denied job promotions due to their non-standard English pronunciation.

The behaviors considered to represent discrimination in general fell close to the midpoint between the "once in a while" and the "often" response categories in all cases except for "avoid looking at Hispanics directly." Eye contact avoidance on the part of Anglos may not be used as an indication of depreciation. On the contrary, Anglos may expect increased eye contact with those they consider inferior: "The use of a steady, direct gaze also connotes status and is a privilege of rank." (Burgoon and Saine, 1978, p. 181). The fact that most of the scales fell in between "once in a while" and "often" appears to be substantive. That a large number of Hispanics feel that at least once in a while they are subjected to insulting, denigrating, and ridiculing behaviors on the parts of Anglos is far from trivial. For discrimination to take place there is no need to experience it "very often" as sometimes is bad enough. Besides, a comment that may apply to all the scales utilized for this study is that the respondents may have

attenuated their responses as the acknowledgement of discrimination is painful and embarrassing. Another comment that may also apply to the entire set of findings is that since 70% of the interviewers were Anglo, the responses obtained might have been in the direction of social desirability, as the Hispanic respondent might have guessed what the Anglo interviewer desired to hear (Reese, Danielson, Shoemaker, Chang and Hsu, 1985).

In attempting the prediction of the *general comdis* index of discriminatory behaviors, it was found that discrimination in public places, e.g. work, school, etc. showed the highest partial standardized regression coefficient. The interpretation of this finding is that Hispanics are more likely to experience behaviors considered as discriminatory in public places, and to be more able to point to those situations more consistently than, for example, they can when considering the types of persons who discriminate. In order to further refine our understanding of this finding, a second regression analysis was conducted in which the components of the index *public places* were entered in the equation as separate entities. In this secondary analysis, work (β=.27, p=.002) and school (β=.25, p=.001) came out as the only significant predictors of the *general comdis* index among all the situations/contexts. Thus, it appears that at school and at work, Hispanics are more consistently treated in insulting ways than in other settings.

The next largest significant predictor of *general comdis* was *personal contexts* composed of neighbors, friends, and landlords/landladies. In this instance, however, none of the individual items remained a significant predictor when a second regression equation was examined. Following school and work, neighbors, friends, and landlords/landladies are likely to perpetrate derogatory interactions. The third largest and last significant predictor was the *ethnic attributes* index composed of skin color, accent, dress, ways of speaking, national background, and race. Race was the only individual item which made a significant statistical contribution (β=.18, p=.05) when analyzed in a secondary regression equation. The interpretation of this finding is that "put-downs" toward Hispanics are most likely to be perceived to be based on race as a generalized identity marker.

When predicting *personal/specific* communication discrimination, the key predictors were similar to those above, except that *personal contexts* became larger and negative, and that males (as opposed to females) were more likely to engage in insulting behaviors. It was suprising that *personal contexts* (neighbors, friends, landlords/landladies) increased in its β coefficient and became negative. It is possible that when thinking and talking about discrimination against oneself, the Hispanic individual is <u>less</u> likely to feel that neighbors, friends, and landlords/landladies engage in discriminatory behaviors because personal experiences may differ from generalized perceptions. This is important since it reconfirms that responses about self are

likely to be different from responses about similar others (Liska, 1975). However, the finding is not free of ambiguity since the *general comdis* index was composed of twelve individual behaviors while the *personal/specific* was the product of the response to "how often do you feel that Anglos treat you differently from the way they treat other Anglos?" multiplied by "how offensive would you say that being treated differently is?" The difference in operationalization, then, may account for the statistical reversal as much as the psychological processes of the respondents. Of concern is that the respondents were more likely to identify men with the oppressor as opposed to women. In a male dominated society, manifestations of oppression are more likely to be enacted by males. As androgyny (Bem, 1974) becomes more prevalent in society, patterns of discrimination may change, hopefully in the direction of being reduced. When a second regression equation was analyzed with the components of *contexts/situations* and another with the components of *ethnic attributes*, it was found that only "race" (ß=.28, p=.02) was a significant contributor to perceptions of insulting and discriminating behaviors. This finding is consistent with the findings related to the general index.

The limitations of this study include the fact that the interviewers were not all bilingual Hispanics, perhaps rendering results which may limit the generalizability of the results. However, the authors believe that if any bias was present, it was in the direction of attenuating claims of discrimination instead of

enhancing them (Reese *et al*, 1985). The fact that this study utilized a telephone sample may have also limited the generalizability of the study as Hispanic telephone ownership is known to be more limited than that of the general population. Further, the fact that the *personal/specific* and the *general comdis* indexes were operationalized differently, may have accounted for the difference encountered in their associations with *personal contexts*. Another limitation is that all questions about communication discrimination in this research referred to Anglos and explicitly excluded other ethnic/cultural groups who may be perceived as discriminators of Hispanics. Future research on *communication discrimination* ought to take the deficits of this research into consideration.

Although limited by many factors, the study's findings are important. It is not only Hispanic opinion leaders (Greenberg *et al*, 1983) who claim to be subjects of discrimination, but the general Hispanic American population who claim to be discriminated against as well.

That work and school are the primary contexts where Hispanics perceive derogatory behaviors to take place is important in alerting employers and school administrators to potential sources of interpersonal conflict, and may serve as encouragement for intercultural communication training in those places. Work places should consider instituting programs generally labeled "training for the multicultural workforce", and

schools should consider programs of multicultural education. In addition, Anglos ought to be aware that joking about skin color, accent, race, etc., is in fact considered offensive and should be avoided if harmonious and productive intercultural interactions are desired.

Discrimination is a difficult topic both methodologically and conceptually. However, its importance in today's world should motivate communication researchers to overcome such difficulties and explore the dimensions of this prevalent phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co..

Bem, S. I. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.

Berry, B. & Tischler, H. L. (1978). *Race and ethnic relations*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co..

Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: face to face interaction*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Burgoon, J. K. & Saine, T. (1978). *The unspoken dialogue: an introduction to nonverbal communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Edwards, J. R. (1979). *Language and disadvantage*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Ehrlich, H. J. (1973). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Greenberg, B. S., Burgoon, M., Burgoon, J. K. and Korzenny, F. (1983). *Mexican Americans and the mass media*. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing Corporation.

Gudykunst, W. B. and Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: an approach to intercultural communication*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hecht, M. L. and Ribeau, S. (1984). Ethnic communication: a comparative analysis of satisfying communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8*, 135-151.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). Toward a conceptualization of communication satisfaction. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64,* 47-62.

Kagan, S. (1982). Culture and the development of conflict resolution style. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 13*(1), 43-58.

Kramarae, C. *et al.* (1984). *Language and power.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.

Levine, R. A. and Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Liska, Allen E. (1975). *The consistency controversy.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Makielsky, S.J. (1973). *Beleaguered minorities.* San Francisco, CA: W.H. Freeman and Co..

Marin, G. (1984). Stereotyping Hispanics: the differential effect of research method, label, and degree of contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8*, 17-27.

McLemore, S. D. (1983). *Racial and ethnic relations in America.* Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Oddou, G. & Mendenhall, M. (1984). Person perception in cross-cultural settings: a review of cross-cultural and related cognitive literature. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8,* 77-96.

Reese, S. D., Danielson, W. A., Shoemaker, P. J., Chang, T., & Hsu, H. (1985, May). "Mexican Americans as interviewers and respondents: sources of bias in answers to cultural questions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Honolulu, HI.

Rose, P. I. (1974). *They and we.* New York, NY: Random House.

Shepherd, C.R. (1964). *Small groups: some sociological perspectives.* San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Company.

Strategy Research Corporation. (1984). *U.S. Hispanic market 1984.* Miami, FL: Author.

Triandis, H. C. (1984). *Simpatia* as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(6), 1363-1375.

Triandis, H. C. (1964). Cultural influences upon perception. In L.J. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. I.* (pp. 12-18). New York, NY: Academic Press.

TABLE 1: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SITUATIONS, TYPES OF PERSONS, CHARACTERISTICS, AND BEHAVIORS INDICATIVE OF COMMUNICATION DISCRIMINATION.

	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
SITUATIONS		
At Work	1.1	1.0
At School	1.0	1.0
At the Grocery Store	0.7	0.9
At Government Offices	1.1	0.9
At the Bank	0.7	0.9
At the Doctor's Office	0.5	0.8
At Department Stores	1.0	0.9
At Restaurants	0.9	0.8
As Neighbors	0.9	1.0
As Friends	0.6	0.9
As Landlords or Landladies	1.1	1.0
TYPES OF PERSONS		
Younger rather than older	1.4	0.7
Males rather than females	1.6	0.7
With higher rather than lower education	1.4	0.9
Rich rather than poor	1.5	0.8
CHARACTERISTICS		
Skin color	1.7	0.9
Accent	2.1	0.7
Dress	1.5	0.8
National background	2.0	0.7
Ways of Speaking	2.1	0.7
Race	2.0	0.7

	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
DISCRIMINATORY BEHAVIORS		
Show little interest in the opinions of Hispanics	1.2	0.9
Insulting to Hispanics	1.3	0.8
Ignore Hispanics	1.2	1.0
Make fun of Hispanics	1.5	0.9
Make comments about the ethnic origin of Hispanics	1.3	0.9
Impatient with Hispanics	1.3	1.0
Show little respect for Hispanics	1.4	0.9
Avoid talking to Hispanics	1.1	1.0
Tell ethnic or racial jokes about Hispanics	1.5	0.9
Talk down to Hispanics	1.3	1.0
Exclude Hispanics from their activities	1.3	1.1
Avoid looking at Hispanics directly	0.8	1.0

TABLE 2. STANDARDIZED PARTIAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING GENERAL AND SPECIFIC COMMUNICATION DISCRIMINATION AS PERCEIVED BY HISPANICS

INDEPENDENT INDEXES OR VARIABLES	BETA COEFFICIENTS PREDICTING GENERAL COMDIS INDEX	PERSONAL/SPEC. COMDIS INDEX
Public Places	.54*	.33*
Personal Contexts	.23*	-.52*
SES of Discriminators	.05	.08
Younger vs. Older	.07	-.08
Male vs. Female	.04	.29*
Ethnic attributes	.17*	.19*
CONTROL INDEXES OR VARIABLES		
Years in the U.S.	.08	-.12
Age	.01	.22
Education	.01	-.14
Income	-.07	-.04
Sex	.08	.05
Employed(yes)	.03	.04
Married (yes)	-.02	-.03
Spanish Language Dependence	.12	.12